DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 270 435 SP 027 704

AUTHOR Dilts, Harold E.; And Others
TITLE Study of Teacher Education Graduates, Spring 1980. Academic Year 1980/81. General Frequency Report. Report No. 3 in the Iowa State University Teacher Education Evaluation Project, May 1982.
INSTITUTION Iowa State Univ. of Science and Technology, Ames. Research Inst. for Studies in Education.
PUB DATE May 82
NOTE 51p.; For related documents, see SP 027 705-706.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Graduate Surveys; Higher Education; Preservice Teacher Education; *Program Effectiveness; *Program Evaluation; *Student Attitudes; Student Characteristics; *Teacher Education Programs; *Teaching (Occupation)
IDENTIFIERS *Iowa State University

ABSTRACT

Four hundred ninety-six education graduates from Iowa State University (1980-81) responded to questionnaires asking them to provide demographic, occupational, and program evaluation information. Data were collected on: (1) students' academic records; (2) student teaching experiences; (3) self-evaluation as future teachers; (4) evaluations of the teacher education program; (5) evaluations of the importance of various job characteristics; and (6) future occupational plans. Results of the study are presented in tables as well as in brief narrative summaries of open-ended questions. In general, graduates indicated satisfaction with their teacher education program, and more than two-thirds of the graduates planned to teach. Results from items asking the graduates to rate the relative importance of job characteristics indicated that the respondents most valued opportunities to work with and help people, challenge, and variety in their work. (JD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED270435

Study of Teacher Education Graduates
Spring 1980
Academic Year 1980|81

General Frequency Report

Report No. 3 in the Iowa State University
Teacher Education Evaluation Project
May 1982

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

J. Breiter

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

STUDY OF TEACHER EDUCATION GRADUATES

SPRING, 1980

ACADEMIC YEAR 1980/1981

General Frequency Report

by

Harold E. Dilts
Richard D. Warren
Ann D. Thompson
Marilyn H. Blaustein

With the assistance of

Terry Franco
Anthony Steinhauser

Report No. 3 in the Iowa State University Teacher Education Evaluation Project

Research Institute for Studies in Education
College of Education
Iowa State University
Ames, Iowa
May, 1982

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	page
INTRODUCTION	1
Objectives	1
Survey Procedures	2
RESULTS	3
General Characteristics	3
Teacher Preparation	10
Future Plans	16
Program Evaluation	33
SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS	45
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	47

LIST OF TABLES

Table		page
1.	Demographic Characteristics of the Respondents	4
2.	Academic Characteristics at Time of Admission	7
3.	Academic Characteristics at Iowa State	8
4.	Expected Area of Approval or Certification for Students Graduating After Spring 1980	12
5.	Student Teaching Characteristics	13
6.	Satisfaction With Student Teaching Experience	14
7.	Factors Related to Becoming a Teacher	15
8.	Plans for Next Year	18
9.	Importance of Factors in Obtaining Present Position	19
10.	Importance of Factors in Decision to Accept Present Position	22
11.	Reasons for not Teaching Next Year	26
12.	Long-Range Career Plans	27
13.	Importance of Job Characteristics	28
14.	Program Evaluation From Respondents	34
15.	Computer Training During Academic Program	42
16.	Characteristics of the Best Teacher	43

INTRODUCTION

This study of teacher education students at the time of graduation focused primarily on obtaining demographic information, program information and evaluations, and occupational plans and values of the graduates.[1] Information was collected about students' academic records, student teaching experiences, self-evaluations as future teachers, evaluations of the Teacher Education Program, evaluations of the importance of various job characteristics, and future occupational plans. Further information will be collected from the same group one year after their graduation and at planned intervals thereafter.

OBJECTIVES

The primary objectives of this study were:

1. To obtain baseline data on these graduates for longitudinal analyses relating to the Teacher Education Program and its participants.
2. To obtain a demographic profile of teacher education graduates with respect to sex, age, marital status, family background and academic achievement.

---

[1] The study reported here represents one phase of a larger RISE research effort directed at the development and testing of a comprehensive teacher education evaluation model.

3. To determine student attitudes and opinions about the quality of the Teacher Education Program at Iowa State University.
4. To obtain information about job characteristics important to teacher education graduates.
5. To obtain information about student occupational plans.

SURVEY PROCEDURES

The study was conducted at the end of the Spring Quarter in 1980 and at the end of the Fall, Winter, Spring, and Summer Quarters during the 1980/1981 school year.

The initial questionnaire was sent approximately three weeks prior to the end of each of the quarters. All teacher education students whose names appeared on the "intending to graduate" list were sent questionnaires.[2] A second questionnaire and reminder letter were sent to all graduates who had not returned the first questionnaire after two weeks. A total of 496 (72%) questionnaires were returned and included in the study.

Although the questionnaires administered to the five groups of students were similar, slight modifications in the questionnaire were made after the Spring, 1980 results, and thus a few of the questions were asked only of graduates after Spring, 1980. One of the questions was also modified by quarter because of circumstances unique to the time of year of graduation.

---

[2] Questionnaires from students whose names appeared on the list and who did not actually graduate and/or qualify for certification were removed from the study at a later date.

RESULTS

The results of the study are presented in two ways. Generally, the categories presented in the tables were taken directly from the questionnaires. In the case of open-ended items, however, the results are summarized through categories derived from the graduates' written-in responses (Table 16).

GENERAL CHARACTERISTICS

The majority of the respondents were female (77%), age 20-22 (69%), and single (75%) (Table 1). More than half of the respondents had spent the majority of their lives in a town with a population less than 5,000, in a rural area, or on a farm.

A large majority of the respondents came from families where the fathers' occupations were either professional, managerial or farming. Sixty percent of the graduates had mothers who were primarily housewives. Of the students who had mothers who were employed outside the home, more than 50 percent indicated that their mothers had professional, managerial or technical positions. Combined, these data suggest that the majority of the respondents came from middle class or upper middle class backgrounds.

Ninety-five percent of the respondents were in the top half of their high school graduating class with respect to grade point average and 34 percent had grade point averages placing them in the top 10 percent of

TABLE 1

Demographic Characteristics of the Respondents

CHARACTERISTIC/GROUPING		NUMBER	RELATIVE (PCT)	ADJUSTED* (PCT)
SEX				
Female		382	77.0	77.0
Male		114	23.0	23.0
	TOTAL	496	100.0	100.0
AGE				
20-21		90	18.1	18.5
22		245	49.4	50.3
23-24		98	19.8	20.2
25-over		54	10.9	11.1
No answer		9	1.8	****
	TOTAL	496	100.0	100.0
MARITAL STATUS				
Single		367	74.0	74.6
Married		118	23.8	24.0
Other		7	1.4	1.4
No answer		4	0.8	****
	TOTAL	496	100.0	100.0
PLACE OF RESIDENCE**				
Farm		104	32.7	33.3
Non-farm country home		12	3.8	3.8
Town less than 5,000		43	13.5	13.8
Town 5,000 to 50,000		82	25.8	26.3
City over 50,000		71	22.3	22.8
No answer		6	1.9	****
	TOTAL	318	100.0	100.0

TABLE 1 (Continued)

Demographic Characteristics of the Respondents

CHARACTERISTIC/GROUPING	NUMBER	RELATIVE (PCT)	ADJUSTED (PCT)
FATHERS' OCCUPATION			
Professional & technical	123	24.8	25.8
Managers & officials	82	16.5	17.2
Farmers & farm managers	151	30.4	31.7
Clerical	11	2.2	2.3
Salesworkers	34	6.8	7.1
Craftsmen	41	8.3	8.6
Operatives	12	2.4	2.5
Service & private household	7	1.4	1.5
Laborers	1	0.2	0.2
Deceased	13	2.6	2.7
Other	1	0.2	0.2
Not specified	20	4.0	****
TOTAL	496	100.0	100.0
MOTHERS' OCCUPATION			
Professional & technical	97	19.6	20.0
Managers & officials	15	3.0	3.1
Farmers & farm managers	6	1.2	1.2
Homemakers	288	58.1	59.5
Clerical	44	8.9	9.1
Salesworkers	7	1.4	1.4
Craftsmen	3	0.6	0.6
Operatives	3	0.6	0.6
Service & private household	20	4.0	4.1
Laborers	1	0.2	0.2
Not specified	12	2.4	****
TOTAL	496	100.0	100.0

* The percentages in the "ADJUSTED PCT" column have been calculated based on the number of respondents remaining after eliminating missing answers (including "Not specified" and "No answer").

** This question was not asked of Spring, 1980 graduates.

their high school graduating class (Table 2). More than three-fourths of the graduates had ACT scores of 20 or above and 33 percent had scores of 26 or above. More than 90 percent of the respondents scored at or above the national average ACT score of 17.2 for students planning to major in education fields.[3] A majority of the respondents (68%) entered Iowa State as first quarter freshmen whereas the remaining 32% entered as transfer students.

Almost half (45%) of the graduates were enrolled in the College of Education and 26 percent were enrolled in the College of Home Economics (Table 3). Thirty percent were elementary education majors and 14 percent were home economics majors. Twelve percent of the graduates had majors in child development and 11 percent were physical education majors. Less than one percent of the graduates had majors in each of the following areas: chemistry, earth science, French, general science, history, psychology, sociology, speech and Spanish.

Most of the respondents graduated in either Spring, 1980 or Spring, 1981. Twelve percent graduated in Fall, 1980; nine percent in Winter, 1981; and seven percent in Summer, 1981.

Fifty-nine percent of the respondents earned a grade point average above 3.0 at the time of graduation and 18 percent earned a grade point average above 3.5. Five percent had a grade point average between 2.3 and 2.5. The average grade point was 3.1.

---

[3] Elam, Stanley M. A Decade of Gallup Polls of Attitudes Toward Education 1969-1978. Bloomington, Indiana: Phi Delta Kappa, 1978, p. 74.

TABLE 2

Academic Characteristics at Time of Admission

CHARACTERISTIC/GROUPING	NUMBER	RELATIVE (PCT)	ADJUSTED (PCT)
HIGH SCHOOL RANK			
1	12	2.4	2.9
2	11	2.2	2.7
3	11	2.2	2.7
4	10	2.0	2.4
5	18	3.6	4.4
6	22	4.4	5.4
7	17	3.4	4.2
8	6	1.2	1.5
9	18	3.6	4.4
10	15	3.0	3.7
11-15	58	11.7	14.2
16-20	49	9.9	12.0
21-25	46	9.3	11.0
26-30	27	5.4	6.6
31-35	27	5.4	6.6
36-40	17	3.4	4.2
41-50	24	4.8	5.9
51-60	15	3.0	3.7
61-70	2	0.4	0.5
71-80	2	0.4	0.5
81-100	1	0.2	0.2
Not specified	88	17.7	****
TOTAL	496	100.0	100.0
ACT SCORE			
28 and above	51	10.3	14.1
26-27	68	13.7	18.8
20-25	160	32.3	44.3
17-19	46	9.3	12.7
16 and below	36	7.3	10.0
Not available	135	27.2	****
TOTAL	496	100.0	100.0
ENTERING STATUS			
Entered ISU as freshman	339	68.3	68.3
Entered as transfer	157	31.7	31.7
TOTAL	496	100.0	100.0

TABLE 3

Academic Characteristics at Iowa State

CHARACTERISTIC/GROUPING	NUMBER	RELATIVE (PCT)	ADJUSTED (PCT)
COLLEGE			
Agriculture	44	8.9	8.9
Design	18	3.6	3.6
Education	224	45.2	45.2
Home Economics	129	26.0	26.0
Science & Humanities	81	16.3	16.3
TOTAL	496	100.0	100.0
MAJOR			
Agricultural education	43	8.7	8.7
Art education	17	3.4	3.4
Biology	12	2.4	2.4
Child development	59	11.9	11.9
Chemistry	1	0.2	0.2
Earth science	1	0.2	0.2
Elementary education	148	29.8	29.8
English	16	3.2	3.2
French	2	0.4	0.4
General science	1	0.2	0.2
Home economics education	69	13.9	13.9
History	2	0.4	0.4
Industrial education	21	4.2	4.2
Journalism	7	1.4	1.4
Mathematics	9	1.8	1.8
Music	13	2.6	2.6
Physical education	56	11.3	11.3
Psychology	3	0.6	0.6
Sociology	1	0.2	0.2
Social studies	8	1.6	1.6
Speech	4	0.8	0.8
Spanish	3	0.6	0.6
TOTAL	496	100.0	100.0

TABLE 3 (Continued)

Academic Characteristics at Iowa State

CHARACTERISTIC/GROUPING	NUMBER	RELATIVE (PCT)	ADJUSTED (PCT)
QUARTER GRADUATED			
Spring, 1980	178	35.9	35.9
Fall, 1980	59	11.9	11.9
Winter, 1981	42	8.5	8.5
Spring, 1981	182	36.7	36.7
Summer, 1981	35	7.0	7.0
TOTAL	496	100.0	100.0
GRADUATING GRADE POINT AVERAGE			
3.76-4.00	26	5.2	5.2
3.51-3.75	65	13.1	13.1
3.26-3.50	93	18.8	18.8
3.01-3.25	110	22.2	22.2
2.76-3.00	102	20.6	20.6
2.51-2.75	75	15.1	15.1
2.30-2.50	25	5.0	5.0
TOTAL	496	100.0	100.0

TEACHER PREPARATION

Students who responded after Spring Quarter, 1980 were asked to indicate their expected level of certification. Three hundred and seventeen of these graduates responded to the question (see footnote, Table 4). Forty-four percent (141 of 317) expected certification of preschool or elementary teachers (Table 4). Of these 141 students, 69 percent planned on elementary certification and 31 percent planned on certification at the nursery/kindergarten level. Ten percent of the respondents indicated that they would be certified on the K-12 level; of these, 42 percent expected approval in physical education and 39 percent expected approval in art. Forty-six percent planned to be certified at the secondary level; 25 percent of these were home economics majors and 20 percent were agricultural education majors. Less than one percent of the graduates who sought certification at the secondary level listed chemistry, psychology or safety education as an approval area. Sixty-nine percent of the graduates who planned to be certified at the secondary level expected to be approved in one area, whereas 23 percent planned to be approved in two areas and eight percent in three areas.

Most of the respondents student taught for 11-12 weeks (66%). The majority of the respondents (63%) felt that the length of their student teaching was "about right"; 25 percent indicated that the experience should have been longer, and 13 percent thought that the experience should have been shorter (Table 5).

Almost half of the respondents student taught at the secondary level; 30 percent student taught at the elementary level and 12 percent at the

nursery/kindergarten level. Most of the respondents completed their student teaching between Winter, 1980 and Spring, 1981, whereas less than one percent finished before Fall, 1979.

In regard to their satisfaction with their student teaching experience, eighty-four percent of the graduates were either satisfied or very satisfied with the choice of geographical location for student teaching (Table 6). Eighty-eight percent were either satisfied or very satisfied with their cooperating teacher, whereas 77 percent chose one of these descriptors for their university supervisor. Ten percent of the respondents were either dissatisfied or very dissatisfied with their university supervisor. When asked about their reaction to teaching as a career following their student teaching experience, 80 percent of the respondents replied that they were either satisfied or very satisfied; seven percent were either dissatisfied or very dissatisfied.

Additional common patterns in attitudes toward teaching as a career were also revealed by the respondents. Most (67%) had decided to become a teacher at or before the age of 18 (Table 7). Fifty-six percent would choose teaching as a career if they had the decision to make over again. Twelve percent would not choose teaching as a career again, and 33 percent were undecided. When asked to evaluate their future teaching performance, students gave themselves relatively high ratings with 95 percent predicting their future performance as above average or excellent.

TABLE 4

Expected Area of Approval or Certification for Students Graduating After Spring 1980*

LEVEL/AREA	NUMBER	RELATIVE (PCT)	ADJUSTED (PCT)
PRE-SCHOOL/ELEMENTARY LEVEL			
Nursery/kindergarten	44	31.2	31.2
Elementary	97	68.8	68.8
TOTAL	141	100.0	100.0
K-12 - MAJOR AREA			
Art	12	38.7	38.7
Music	5	16.1	16.1
Physical education	13	41.9	41.9
Other	1	3.2	3.2
TOTAL	31	100.0	100.0
SECONDARY - MAJOR AREA			
Agricultural education	29	20.0	20.0
Biology	7	4.8	4.8
Chemistry	1	0.7	0.7
English	7	4.8	4.8
Foreign language	2	1.4	1.4
Home economics education	36	24.8	24.8
Industrial education	14	9.6	9.6
Journalism	4	2.8	2.8
Mathematics	4	2.8	2.8
Music	2	1.4	1.4
Physical education	24	16.6	16.6
Psychology	1	0.7	0.7
Safety education	1	0.7	0.7
Social studies	10	6.9	6.9
Speech	2	1.4	1.4
Other	1	0.7	0.7
TOTAL	145	100.0	100.0
SECONDARY - NUMBER OF APPROVAL AREAS			
One	100	69.0	69.0
Two	33	22.8	22.8
Three	12	8.3	8.3
TOTAL	145	100.0	100.0

* This question was not asked of Spring, 1980 graduates.

TABLE 5

Student Teaching Characteristics

CHARACTERISTIC/GROUPING	NUMBER	RELATIVE (PCT)	ADJUSTED (PCT)
LENGTH OF STUDENT TEACHING			
7 weeks or less	38	7.7	7.7
8-10 weeks	78	15.7	15.7
11-12 weeks	325	65.5	65.5
Over 12 weeks	55	11.1	11.1
TOTAL	496	100.0	100.0
SATISFACTION WITH LENGTH OF STUDENT TEACHING			
Longer	121	24.4	24.5
Shorter	64	12.9	13.0
About right	308	62.1	62.5
No answer	3	0.6	****
TOTAL	496	100.0	100.0
TEACHING LEVEL (Accepted Position)			
Nursery/kindergarten	60	12.1	12.1
Elementary	148	29.8	29.8
K-12	41	8.3	8.3
Secondary	247	49.8	49.8
TOTAL	496	100.0	100.0
QUARTER COMPLETED STUDENT TEACHING			
Before Fall, 1979	4	0.8	0.8
Fall, 1979	40	8.1	8.1
Winter, 1980	77	15.5	15.5
Spring, 1980	71	14.3	14.3
Fall, 1980	111	22.4	22.4
Winter, 1981	98	19.8	19.8
Spring, 1981	95	19.2	19.2
TOTAL	496	100.0	100.0

TABLE 6

Satisfaction With Student Teaching Experience

EXPERIENCE/SATISFACTION		NUMBER	RELATIVE (PCT)	ADJUSTED (PCT)	CUM (PCT)
CHOICE OF GEOGRAPHICAL LOCATION					
Very satisfied		328	66.1	66.4	66.4
Satisfied		86	17.3	17.4	83.8
Neutral		29	5.8	5.9	89.7
Dissatisfied		27	5.4	5.5	95.1
Very dissatisfied		24	4.8	4.9	100.0
No answer		2	0.4	****	100.0
	TOTAL	496	100.0	100.0	
COOPERATING TEACHER					
Very satisfied		308	62.1	62.2	62.2
Satisfied		126	25.4	25.5	87.7
Neutral		38	7.7	7.7	95.4
Dissatisfied		18	3.6	3.6	99.0
Very dissatisfied		5	1.0	1.0	100.0
No answer		1	0.2	****	100.0
	TOTAL	496	100.0	100.0	
UNIVERSITY SUPERVISOR					
Very satisfied		237	47.8	48.1	48.1
Satisfied		143	28.8	29.0	77.1
Neutral		62	12.5	12.6	89.7
Dissatisfied		39	7.9	7.9	97.6
Very dissatisfied		12	2.4	2.4	100.0
No answer		3	0.6	****	100.0
	TOTAL	496	100.0	100.0	
REACTION TO TEACHING AS A CAREER					
Very satisfied		245	49.4	49.7	49.7
Satisfied		151	30.4	30.6	80.3
Neutral		63	12.7	12.8	93.1
Dissatisfied		24	4.8	4.9	98.0
Very dissatisfied		10	2.0	2.0	100.0
No answer		3	0.6	****	100.0
	TOTAL	496	100.0	100.0	

TABLE 7

Factors Related to Becoming a Teacher

ITEM/RESPONSE	NUMBER	RELATIVE (PCT)	ADJUSTED (PCT)	CUM (PCT)
AGE WHEN DECIDED TO BECOME A TEACHER				
4-9	35	7.0	7.4	7.4
10-15	98	19.8	20.8	28.2
16	66	13.3	14.0	42.2
17	34	6.8	7.2	49.4
18	84	16.9	17.9	67.3
19	62	12.5	13.2	80.5
20	45	9.1	9.6	90.1
21 and over	46	9.4	9.9	100.0
No answer	26	5.2	****	100.0
TOTAL	496	100.0	100.0	
WOULD YOU PREPARE TO BE A TEACHER AGAIN?				
Yes	274	55.2	55.8	55.8
Undecided	160	32.3	32.6	88.4
No	57	11.5	11.6	100.0
No answer	5	1.0	****	100.0
TOTAL	496	100.0	100.0	
SELF EVALUATION OF FUTURE TEACHING PERFORMANCE				
Excellent	205	41.3	41.8	41.8
Above average	260	52.4	53.0	94.8
Average	22	4.4	4.5	99.3
Below average	3	0.6	0.6	99.9
Inadequate	1	0.2	0.2	100.0
No answer	5	1.0	****	100.0
TOTAL	496	100.0	100.0	

FUTURE PLANS

Sixty-nine percent of the respondents planned to teach during the school year following their graduation and 24 percent of these had already accepted a teaching position at the time of graduation (Table 8). Of the graduates who had accepted a teaching position, 58 percent had accepted secondary positions and 40 percent had accepted elementary or nursery/kindergarten positions. Three percent had accepted positions in adult education. Of the students who indicated that they did not plan to teach following graduation, 19 percent already had accepted a nonacademic position.

The employed graduates indicated that direct contacts were the most important factor in obtaining their current positions with 94 percent citing direct personal application as important or very important (Table 9). Sixty-two percent rated the want ads as an important or very important factor and 42 percent rated the college placement office in one of these two categories. "Employer contacted you directly" was cited as important or very important by 60 percent of the respondents. The 108 graduates who had accepted either teaching positions or positions outside of education were asked about the importance of various factors in accepting these positions. Eighty-seven percent of this group indicated that "desirable location" was either an important or very important factor in their decision to accept their current position (Table 10). Forty-seven percent indicated that salary was either an important or very important consideration, and ninety-two percent reported that "liked people with whom I interviewed" was

important or very important. Three questions about factors pertinent to the decision to accept their current positions were not asked of the Spring, 1980 graduates but were asked of the remaining four groups of graduates. Among these three, the item dealing with the type of assignment was rated as most important. Ninety-two percent of the 56 employed graduates in this group indicated that the type of assignment was either important or very important in their decision to accept their present position.

Among the respondents who indicated that they had chosen not to teach the year following graduation, the most frequently cited reasons were failure to find a position in the desired location and better salaries in non-teaching positions. Thirty-two percent of the respondents chose each of these (Table 11). Twenty-three percent of the respondents chose "marriage/family obligations". The option "plan to wait to apply for Fall, 1981" was also included for the Fall, 1980 and Winter, 1981 graduates and 15 percent of these respondents chose this option.

The graduates were asked to check all the responses which described their long-range career plans. Fifty-nine percent of the graduates indicated that their long-range career plans included remaining in a teaching position, whereas 25 percent planned to seek a nonacademic position (Table 12). The responses to the long-range career plan question were grouped into the following mutually exclusive categories: graduates who chose only teaching, graduates who chose only employment in education other than teaching, graduates who chose both teaching and other employment in education, graduates who chose both employment in education and employment outside of education and graduates who chose

TABLE 8

Plans for Next Year

PLAN/RESPONSE		NUMBER	RELATIVE (PCT)	ADJUSTED (PCT)
PLAN TO TEACH NEXT YEAR				
Yes		335	67.6	69.1
No		150	30.2	30.9
No answer		11	2.2	****
	TOTAL	496	100.0	100.0
ACCEPTED TEACHING POSITION				
Yes		80	16.1	23.9
No		255	51.4	76.1
Do not plan to teach		150	30.2	****
No answer		11	2.2	****
	TOTAL	496	100.0	100.0
TEACHING LEVEL				
Nursery-kindergarten		13	16.2	16.7
Elementary		18	22.5	23.1
Secondary		45	56.3	57.7
Adult education		2	2.5	2.6
No answer		2	2.5	****
	TOTAL	80	100.0	100.0
ACCEPTED NONACADEMIC JOB				
Yes		28	5.6	19.4
No		116	23.4	80.6
Plan to teach		335	67.6	****
No answer		17	3.4	****
	TOTAL	496	100.0	100.0

TABLE 9

Importance of Factors in Obtaining Present Position

FACTOR/IMPORTANCE	NUMBER	RELATIVE (PCT)	ADJUSTED (PCT)	CUM (PCT)
FACULTY ADVISOR OR PROFESSOR				
Very important	14	13.0	18.4	18.4
Important	17	15.7	22.4	40.8
Neutral	16	14.8	21.1	61.8
Unimportant	9	8.3	11.8	73.7
Very unimportant	20	18.5	26.3	100.0
Not applicable	24	22.2	****	100.0
No answer	8	11.3	****	100.0
TOTAL	108	100.0	100.0	
COLLEGE PLACEMENT OFFICE				
Very important	15	13.9	19.2	19.2
Important	18	16.7	23.1	42.3
Neutral	18	16.7	23.1	65.4
Unimportant	10	9.3	12.8	78.2
Very unimportant	17	15.7	21.8	100.0
Not applicable	22	20.4	****	100.0
No answer	8	11.3	****	100.0
TOTAL	108	100.0	100.0	
DIRECT PERSONAL APPLICATION				
Very important	62	57.4	66.7	66.7
Important	25	23.1	26.9	93.5
Neutral	2	1.9	2.2	95.7
Unimportant	3	2.8	3.2	98.9
Very unimportant	1	0.9	1.1	100.0
Not applicable	7	6.5	****	100.0
No answer	8	11.3	****	100.0
TOTAL	108	100.0	100.0	

TABLE 9 (Continued)

Importance of Factors in Obtaining Present Position

FACTOR/IMPORTANCE	NUMBER	RELATIVE (PCT)	ADJUSTED (PCT)	CUM (PCT)
STATE EMPLOYMENT AGENCIES				
Very important	1	0.9	2.8	2.8
Important	3	2.8	8.3	11.1
Neutral	5	4.6	13.9	25.0
Unimportant	6	5.6	16.7	41.7
Very unimportant	21	19.4	58.3	100.0
Not applicable	63	58.3	****	100.0
No answer	9	8.3	****	100.0
TOTAL	108	100.0	100.0	
PRIVATE EMPLOYMENT AGENCIES				
Very important	1	0.9	3.0	3.0
Important	2	1.9	6.1	9.1
Neutral	5	4.6	15.2	24.2
Unimportant	4	3.7	12.1	36.4
Very unimportant	21	19.4	63.6	100.0
Not applicable	66	61.1	****	100.0
No answer	9	8.3	****	100.0
TOTAL	108	100.0	100.0	
FAMILY CONTACTS				
Very important	9	8.3	17.3	17.3
Important	13	12.0	25.0	42.3
Neutral	6	5.6	11.5	53.8
Unimportant	5	4.6	9.6	63.5
Very unimportant	19	17.6	36.5	100.0
Not applicable	48	44.4	****	100.0
No answer	8	11.3	****	100.0
TOTAL	108	100.0	100.0	

TABLE 9 (Continued)

Importance of Factors in Obtaining Present Position

FACTOR/IMPORTANCE	NUMBER	RELATIVE (PCT)	ADJUSTED (PCT)	CUM (PCT)
WANT ADS				
Very important	31	28.7	44.9	44.9
Important	12	11.1	17.4	62.3
Neutral	7	6.5	10.1	72.5
Unimportant	3	2.8	4.3	76.8
Very unimportant	16	14.8	23.2	100.0
Not applicable	32	29.6	****	100.0
No answer	7	6.5	****	100.0
TOTAL	108	100.0	100.0	
PROFESSIONAL SOCIETIES OR CONTACTS				
Very important	7	6.5	15.6	15.6
Important	9	8.3	20.0	35.6
Neutral	5	4.6	11.1	46.7
Unimportant	4	3.7	8.9	55.6
Very unimportant	20	18.5	44.4	100.0
Not applicable	54	50.0	****	100.0
No answer	9	8.3	****	100.0
TOTAL	108	100.0	100.0	
EMPLOYER CONTACTED INDIVIDUAL				
Very important	19	17.6	33.3	33.3
Important	15	13.9	26.3	59.6
Neutral	7	6.5	12.3	71.9
Unimportant	2	1.9	3.5	75.4
Very unimportant	14	13.0	24.6	100.0
Not applicable	42	38.9	****	100.0
No answer	9	8.3	****	100.0
TOTAL	108	100.0	100.0	

TABLE 10

Importance of Factors in Decision to Accept Present Position

FACTOR/IMPORTANCE	NUMBER	RELATIVE (PCT)	ADJUSTED (PCT)	CUM (PCT)
DESIRABLE LOCATION				
Very important	41	38.0	47.7	47.7
Important	34	31.5	39.5	87.2
Neutral	7	6.5	8.1	95.3
Unimportant	3	2.8	3.5	98.8
Very unimportant	1	0.9	1.2	100.0
No answer	22	20.4	****	100.0
TOTAL	108	100.0	100.0	
SALARY OFFERED				
Very important	12	11.1	14.1	14.1
Important	28	25.9	32.9	47.1
Neutral	33	30.6	38.8	85.9
Unimportant	9	8.3	10.6	96.5
Very unimportant	3	2.8	3.5	100.0
No answer	23	21.3	****	100.0
TOTAL	108	100.0	100.0	
LIKED PEOPLE WITH WHOM I INTERVIEWED				
Very important	38	35.2	46.3	46.3
Important	37	34.3	45.1	91.5
Neutral	5	4.6	6.1	97.6
Unimportant	1	0.9	1.2	98.8
Very unimportant	1	0.9	1.2	100.0
Not applicable	4	3.7	****	100.0
No answer	22	20.4	****	100.0
TOTAL	108	100.0	100.0	

TABLE 10 (Continued)

Importance of Factors in Decision to Accept Present Position

FACTOR/IMPORTANCE	NUMBER	RELATIVE (PCT)	ADJUSTED (PCT)	CUM (PCT)
SPOUSE HAS JOB IN THE COMMUNITY				
Very important	11	10.2	44.0	44.0
Important	5	4.6	20.0	64.0
Neutral	7	6.5	28.0	92.0
Unimportant	1	0.9	4.0	96.0
Very unimportant	1	0.9	4.0	100.0
Not applicable	59	54.6	****	100.0
No answer	24	22.2	****	100.0
TOTAL	108	100.0	100.0	
ONLY JOB I WAS OFFERED				
Very important	3	2.8	9.7	9.7
Important	1	0.9	3.2	12.9
Neutral	13	12.0	41.9	54.8
Unimportant	4	3.7	12.9	67.7
Very unimportant	10	9.3	32.3	100.0
Not applicable	53	49.1	****	100.0
No answer	24	22.2	****	100.0
TOTAL	108	100.0	100.0	

TABLE 10 (Continued)

Importance of Factors in Decision to Accept Present Position

FACTOR/IMPORTANCE	NUMBER	RELATIVE (PCT)	ADJUSTED (PCT)	CUM (PCT)
TYPE OF ASSIGNMENT*				
Very important	24	42.9	50.0	50.0
Important	20	35.7	41.7	91.7
Neutral	2	3.6	4.2	95.9
Unimportant	2	3.6	4.2	100.0
Not applicable	1	1.8	****	100.0
No answer	7	12.5	****	100.0
TOTAL	56	100.0	100.0	
SIZE OF SCHOOL/ORGANIZATION*				
Very important	3	5.4	7.3	7.3
Important	18	32.1	43.9	51.2
Neutral	17	30.4	41.5	92.7
Unimportant	3	5.4	7.3	100.0
Not applicable	7	12.5	****	100.0
No answer	8	14.3	****	100.0
TOTAL	56	100.0	100.0	
REPUTATION OF SCHOOL, FIRM OR ORGANIZATION*				
Very important	11	19.6	25.0	25.0
Important	16	28.6	36.4	61.4
Neutral	13	23.2	29.5	90.9
Unimportant	3	5.4	6.8	97.7
Very unimportant	1	1.8	2.3	100.0
Not applicable	4	7.1	****	100.0
No answer	8	14.3	****	100.0
TOTAL	56	100.0	100.0	

*This question was not asked of Spring, 1980 graduates.

only employment outside of education. With these groupings, 41 percent of the graduates chose only teaching and 84 percent chose one of the options involving employment in education.

All respondents were also asked to rate the importance of various job characteristics on a scale from "very important" to "very unimportant". The following characteristics were rated as very important by more than 60 percent of the students: the opportunity to work with people rather than with things, the opportunity to help and serve others, the opportunity to be creative and original, challenge, the opportunity to use special abilities or aptitudes, and variety in the work (Table 13). The opportunity to earn a good deal of money, social status and prestige, and control over what others do were all rated very important by less than eight percent of the respondents.

TABLE 11

Reasons for not Teaching Next Year

REASON	NUMBER	PCT OF RESPONSES (R=256*)	PCT OF CASES (N=146**)
ALL GRADUATES			
Graduate study	24	9.4	16.4
Could not find position in desirable location	47	18.4	32.2
Better salaries in non-teaching positions	47	18.4	32.2
Prefer working with adults	28	10.9	19.2
Marriage/family obligations	34	13.3	23.3
Had not planned to enter education	10	3.9	6.8
Experiences in teacher education program	25	9.8	17.1
Liked people with whom I interviewed in non-academic positions	26	10.2	17.8
FALL 1980 - WINTER 1981 GRADUATES***			
Plan to apply for Fall, 1981	15		14.8

*In situations where respondents could provide multiple answers, the "PCT OF RESPONSES" column contains the percent of total responses falling in a particular category.

**The "PCT OF CASES" column contains the percent of respondents who checked a particular option.

***Percent for Fall and Winter based on 101 cases.

TABLE 12

Long-Range Career Plans

PLAN	NUMBER	PCT OF RESPONSES (R=769*)	PCT OF CASES (N=486**)
BY INDIVIDUAL ITEM			
Remain in teaching position	285	37.1	58.6
Change to different teaching level	98	12.7	20.2
Become a counselor	42	5.5	8.6
Become an administrator	75	9.8	15.4
Seek nonacademic job	120	15.6	24.7
Fulltime homemaker	48	6.2	9.8
Other	101	13.1	20.8
		RELATIVE (PCT)	ADJUSTED (PCT)
BY GROUPED ITEMS			
Teaching only	198	39.9	40.7
Non-teaching position in education	39	7.9	8.0
Position outside of education	78	15.7	16.0
Teaching and non-teaching position in education	64	12.9	13.2
Both position in education and position outside education	107	21.6	22.0
No answer	10	2.0	****
TOTAL	496	100.0	100.0

*In situations where respondents could provide multiple answers, the "PCT OF RESPONSES" column contains the percent of total responses falling in a particular category.

**The "PCT OF CASES" column contains the percent of respondents who checked a particular option. Ten respondents did not answer this question.

TABLE 13

Importance of Job Characteristics

CHARACTERISTIC/IMPORTANCE	NUMBER	RELATIVE (PCT)	ADJUSTED (PCT)	CUM (PCT)
OPPORTUNITY TO BE CREATIVE AND ORIGINAL				
Very important	300	60.5	60.5	60.5
Important	181	36.5	36.5	97.0
Neutral	15	3.0	3.0	100.0
TOTAL	496	100.0	100.0	
OPPORTUNITY TO USE SPECIAL ABILITIES OR APTITUDES				
Very important	299	60.3	60.3	60.3
Important	182	36.7	36.7	97.0
Neutral	14	2.8	2.8	99.8
Unimportant	1	0.2	0.2	100.0
TOTAL	496	100.0	100.0	
OPPORTUNITY TO WORK WITH PEOPLE RATHER THAN WITH THINGS				
Very important	363	73.2	73.3	73.3
Important	112	22.6	22.6	96.0
Neutral	19	3.8	3.8	99.8
Very unimportant	1	0.2	0.2	100.0
No answer	1	0.2	****	100.0
TOTAL	496	100.0	100.0	
OPPORTUNITY TO EARN A GOOD DEAL OF MONEY				
Very important	38	7.7	7.7	7.7
Important	201	40.5	40.5	48.2
Neutral	188	37.9	37.9	86.1
Unimportant	58	11.7	11.7	97.8
Very unimportant	11	2.2	2.2	100.0
TOTAL	496	100.0	100.0	

TABLE 13 (Continued)

Importance of Job Characteristics

CHARACTERISTIC/IMPORTANCE	NUMBER	RELATIVE (PCT)	ADJUSTED (PCT)	CUM (PCT)
SOCIAL STATUS AND PRESTIGE				
Very important	15	3.0	3.0	3.0
Important	197	39.7	39.9	42.9
Neutral	201	40.5	40.7	83.6
Unimportant	72	14.5	14.6	98.2
Very unimportant	9	1.8	1.8	100.0
No answer	2	0.4	****	100.0
TOTAL	496	100.0	100.0	
OPPORTUNITY TO EFFECT SOCIAL CHANGE				
Very important	83	16.7	16.9	16.9
Important	243	49.0	49.4	66.3
Neutral	147	29.6	29.9	96.1
Unimportant	19	3.8	3.9	100.0
No answer	4	0.8	****	100.0
TOTAL	496	100.0	100.0	
RELATIVE FREEDOM FROM SUPERVISION BY OTHERS				
Very important	75	15.1	15.1	15.1
Important	247	49.8	49.8	64.9
Neutral	140	28.2	28.2	93.1
Unimportant	27	5.4	5.4	98.6
Very unimportant	7	1.4	1.4	100.0
TOTAL	496	100.0	100.0	
OPPORTUNITY FOR ADVANCEMENT				
Very important	159	32.1	32.1	32.1
Important	227	45.8	45.9	78.0
Neutral	92	18.5	18.6	96.6
Unimportant	15	3.0	3.0	99.6
Very unimportant	2	0.4	0.4	100.0
No answer	1	0.2	****	100.0
TOTAL	496	100.0	100.0	

TABLE 13 (Continued)

Importance of Job Characteristics

CHARACTERISTIC/IMPORTANCE	NUMBER	RELATIVE (PCT)	ADJUSTED (PCT)	CUM (PCT)
OPPORTUNITY TO EXERCISE LEADERSHIP				
Very important	194	39.1	39.1	39.1
Important	224	45.2	45.2	84.3
Neutral	72	14.5	14.5	98.8
Unimportant	5	1.0	1.0	99.8
Very unimportant	1	0.2	0.2	100.0
TOTAL	496	100.0	100.0	
OPPORTUNITY TO HELP AND SERVE OTHERS				
Very important	331	66.7	66.7	66.7
Important	152	30.6	30.6	97.4
Neutral	13	2.6	2.6	100.0
TOTAL	496	100.0	100.0	
ADVENTURE				
Very important	160	32.3	32.4	32.4
Important	194	39.1	39.3	71.7
Neutral	113	22.8	22.9	94.5
Unimportant	25	5.0	5.1	99.6
Very unimportant	2	0.4	0.4	100.0
No answer	2	0.4	****	100.0
TOTAL	496	100.0	100.0	
OPPORTUNITY FOR A RELATIVELY STABLE AND SECURE FUTURE				
Very important	153	30.8	31.0	31.0
Important	269	54.2	54.5	85.4
Neutral	64	12.9	13.0	98.4
Unimportant	8	1.6	1.6	100.0
No answer	2	0.4	****	100.0
TOTAL	496	100.0	100.0	

TABLE 13 (Continued)

Importance of Job Characteristics

CHARACTERISTIC/IMPORTANCE	NUMBER	RELATIVE (PCT)	ADJUSTED (PCT)	CUM (PCT)
FRINGE BENEFITS				
Very important	121	24.4	24.4	24.4
Important	272	54.8	54.8	79.2
Neutral	85	17.1	17.1	96.4
Unimportant	18	3.6	3.6	100.0
TOTAL	496	100.0	100.0	
VARIETY IN THE WORK				
Very important	298	60.1	60.1	60.1
Important	177	35.7	35.7	95.8
Neutral	20	4.0	4.0	99.8
Unimportant	1	0.2	0.2	100.0
TOTAL	496	100.0	100.0	
RESPONSIBILITY				
Very important	256	51.6	51.6	51.6
Important	223	45.0	45.0	96.6
Neutral	16	3.2	3.2	99.8
Unimportant	1	0.2	0.2	100.0
TOTAL	496	100.0	100.0	
CONTROL OVER WHAT I DO				
Very important	279	56.3	56.3	56.3
Important	202	40.7	40.7	97.0
Neutral	14	2.8	2.8	99.8
Unimportant	1	0.2	0.2	100.0
TOTAL	496	100.0	100.0	

TABLE 13 (Continued)

Importance of Job Characteristics

CHARACTERISTIC/IMPORTANCE	NUMBER	RELATIVE (PCT)	ADJUSTED (PCT)	CUM (PCT)
CONTROL OVER WHAT OTHERS DO				
Very important	24	4.8	4.8	4.8
Important	171	34.5	34.5	39.3
Neutral	238	48.0	48.0	87.3
Unimportant	58	11.7	11.7	99.0
Very unimportant	5	1.0	1.0	100.0
TOTAL	496	100.0	100.0	
CHALLENGE				
Very important	309	62.3	62.3	62.3
Important	166	33.5	33.5	95.8
Neutral	20	4.0	4.0	99.8
Unimportant	1	0.2	0.2	100.0
TOTAL	496	100.0	100.0	

PROGRAM EVALUATION

In response to an item asking the graduates to rate the adequacy of the Teacher Education Program in various areas on a scale from "very adequate" to "very inadequate", more than 70 percent of the respondents rated preparation in the following areas as adequate or very adequate: content area preparation, planning units of instruction or individual lessons, ability to use instructional media, relating activities to interests and abilities of students, knowledge of materials and resources in specialty area, evaluating own instruction, and selecting and organizing materials (Table 14). More than 30 percent of the respondents rated their preparation in the following areas as inadequate or very inadequate: methods of dealing with the emotionally disturbed, methods of dealing with learning problems, diagnosing the learning disabled, understanding and dealing with behavior problems in the classroom, and skill in working with parents.

TABLE 14

Program Evaluation From Respondents

PROGRAM/ADEQUACY	NUMBER	RELATIVE (PCT)	ADJUSTED (PCT)	CUM (PCT)
PLANNING UNITS OF INSTRUCTION AND INDIVIDUAL LESSONS				
Very adequate	129	26.0	26.1	26.1
Adequate	244	49.2	49.3	75.4
Neutral	70	14.1	14.1	89.5
Inadequate	48	9.7	9.7	99.2
Very inadequate	4	0.8	0.8	100.0
No answer	1	0.2	****	100.0
TOTAL	496	100.0	100.0	
ABILITY TO PREPARE AND USE INSTRUCTIONAL MEDIA AND EQUIPMENT				
Very adequate	136	27.4	27.6	27.6
Adequate	247	49.8	50.1	77.7
Neutral	71	14.3	14.4	92.1
Inadequate	34	6.9	6.9	99.0
Very inadequate	5	1.0	1.0	100.0
Not applicable	1	0.2	****	100.0
No answer	2	0.4	****	100.0
TOTAL	496	100.0	100.0	
MAINTAINING STUDENT INTEREST IN CLASSROOM ACTIVITIES				
Very adequate	69	13.9	14.0	14.0
Adequate	222	44.8	45.0	59.0
Neutral	126	25.4	25.6	84.6
Inadequate	64	12.9	13.0	97.6
Very inadequate	12	2.4	2.4	100.0
Not applicable	1	0.2	****	100.0
No answer	2	0.4	****	100.0
TOTAL	496	100.0	100.0	

TABLE 14 (Continued)

Program Evaluation From Respondents

PROGRAM/ADEQUACY	NUMBER	RELATIVE (PCT)	ADJUSTED (PCT)	CUM (PCT)
UNDERSTANDING AND DEALING WITH BEHAVIOR PROBLEMS IN THE CLASSROOM				
Very adequate	46	9.3	9.3	9.3
Adequate	154	31.0	31.0	40.3
Neutral	135	27.2	27.2	67.5
Inadequate	116	23.4	23.4	90.9
Very inadequate	45	9.1	9.1	100.0
TOTAL	496	100.0	100.0	
METHODS OF DEALING WITH EMOTIONALLY DISTURBED				
Very adequate	20	4.0	4.3	4.3
Adequate	69	13.9	14.8	19.1
Neutral	119	24.0	25.5	44.5
Inadequate	162	32.7	34.7	79.2
Very inadequate	97	19.6	20.8	100.0
Not applicable	27	5.4	****	100.0
No answer	2	0.4	****	100.0
TOTAL	496	100.0	100.0	
METHODS OF DEALING WITH LEARNING PROBLEMS				
Very adequate	21	4.2	4.4	4.4
Adequate	100	20.2	20.9	25.3
Neutral	123	24.8	25.7	51.0
Inadequate	150	30.2	31.4	82.4
Very inadequate	84	16.9	17.6	100.0
Not applicable	17	3.4	****	100.0
No answer	1	0.2	****	100.0
TOTAL	496	100.0	100.0	

TABLE 14 (Continued)

Program Evaluation From Respondents

PROGRAM/ADEQUACY	NUMBER	RELATIVE (PCT)	ADJUSTED (PCT)	CUM (PCT)
DIAGNOSIS OF LEARNING DISABILITIES				
Very adequate	19	3.8	4.1	4.1
Adequate	79	15.9	16.8	20.9
Neutral	112	22.6	23.9	44.8
Inadequate	163	32.9	34.8	79.5
Very inadequate	96	19.4	20.5	100.0
Not applicable	26	5.2	****	100.0
No answer	1	0.2	****	100.0
TOTAL	496	100.0	100.0	
SKILL IN DEVELOPING TESTS				
Very adequate	54	10.9	11.3	11.3
Adequate	194	39.1	40.6	51.9
Neutral	122	24.6	25.5	77.4
Inadequate	80	16.1	16.7	94.1
Very inadequate	28	5.6	5.9	100.0
Not applicable	17	3.4	****	100.0
No answer	1	0.2	****	100.0
TOTAL	496	100.0	100.0	
COMPREHENSION AND USE OF STANDARDIZED TESTS				
Very adequate	48	9.7	10.1	10.1
Adequate	198	39.9	41.9	52.0
Neutral	138	27.8	29.2	81.2
Inadequate	72	14.5	15.2	96.4
Very inadequate	17	3.4	3.6	100.0
Not applicable	20	4.0	****	100.0
No answer	3	0.6	****	100.0
TOTAL	496	100.0	100.0	

TABLE 14 (Continued)

Program Evaluation From Respondents

PROGRAM/ADEQUACY	NUMBER	RELATIVE (PCT)	ADJUSTED (PCT)	CUM (PCT)
CONTENT PREPARATION IN YOUR AREA OF SPECIALIZATION				
Very adequate	182	36.7	37.4	37.4
Adequate	203	40.9	41.8	79.2
Neutral	67	13.5	13.8	93.0
Inadequate	28	5.6	5.8	98.8
Very inadequate	6	1.2	1.2	100.0
Not applicable	10	2.0	****	100.0
TOTAL	496	100.0	100.0	
COMPREHENSION OF PROFESSIONAL ETHICS AND LEGAL OBLIGATIONS				
Very adequate	71	14.3	14.3	14.3
Adequate	226	45.6	45.7	60.0
Neutral	123	24.8	24.8	84.8
Inadequate	54	10.9	10.9	95.8
Very inadequate	21	4.2	4.2	100.0
Not applicable	1	0.2	****	100.0
TOTAL	496	100.0	100.0	
KNOWLEDGE OF PSYCHOLOGY OF LEARNING AND ITS APPLICATION TO TEACHING				
Very adequate	96	19.4	19.4	19.4
Adequate	238	48.0	48.2	67.6
Neutral	133	26.8	26.9	94.5
Inadequate	24	4.8	4.9	99.4
Very inadequate	3	0.6	0.6	100.0
Not applicable	1	0.2	****	100.0
No answer	1	0.2	****	100.0
TOTAL	496	100.0	100.0	

TABLE 14 (Continued)

Program Evaluation From Respondents

PROGRAM/ADEQUACY	NUMBER	RELATIVE (PCT)	ADJUSTED (PCT)	CUM (PCT)
EVALUATING AND REPORTING STUDENT WORK AND ACHIEVEMENT				
Very adequate	75	15.1	5.2	15.2
Adequate	247	49.8	50.2	65.4
Neutral	106	21.4	21.5	87.0
Inadequate	59	11.9	12.0	99.0
Very inadequate	5	1.0	1.0	100.0
Not applicable	2	0.4	****	100.0
No answer	2	0.4	****	100.0
TOTAL	496	100.0	100.0	
RELATING ACTIVITIES TO INTERESTS AND ABILITIES OF STUDENTS				
Very adequate	116	23.4	23.5	23.5
Adequate	255	51.4	51.7	75.3
Neutral	85	17.1	17.2	92.5
Inadequate	36	7.3	7.3	99.8
Very inadequate	1	0.2	0.2	100.0
No answer	3	0.6	****	100.0
TOTAL	496	100.0	100.0	
KNOWLEDGE OF MATERIALS AND RESOURCES IN SPECIALTY AREA				
Very adequate	135	27.2	27.7	27.7
Adequate	237	47.8	48.6	76.2
Neutral	81	16.3	16.6	92.8
Inadequate	30	6.0	6.1	99.0
Very inadequate	5	1.0	1.0	100.0
Not applicable	7	1.4	****	100.0
No answer	1	0.2	****	100.0
TOTAL	496	100.0	100.0	

TABLE 14 (Continued)

Program Evaluation From Respondents

PROGRAM/ADEQUACY	NUMBER	RELATIVE (PCT)	ADJUSTED (PCT)	CUM (PCT)
EVALUATING OWN INSTRUCTION				
Very adequate	88	17.7	17.8	17.8
Adequate	263	53.0	53.2	71.1
Neutral	101	20.4	20.4	91.5
Inadequate	41	8.3	8.3	99.8
Very inadequate	1	0.2	0.2	100.0
No answer	2	0.4	****	100.0
TOTAL	496	100.0	100.0	
INDIVIDUALIZING INSTRUCTION				
Very adequate	91	18.3	18.4	18.4
Adequate	215	43.3	43.4	61.8
Neutral	109	22.0	22.0	83.8
Inadequate	71	14.3	14.3	98.2
Very inadequate	9	1.8	1.8	100.0
Not applicable	1	0.2	****	100.0
TOTAL	496	100.0	100.0	
SELECTING AND ORGANIZING MATERIALS				
Very adequate	99	20.0	20.1	20.1
Adequate	272	54.8	55.2	75.3
Neutral	88	17.7	17.8	93.1
Inadequate	31	6.3	6.3	99.4
Very inadequate	3	0.6	0.6	100.0
Not applicable	1	0.2	****	100.0
No answer	2	0.4	****	100.0
TOTAL	496	100.0	100.0	

TABLE 14 (Continued)

Program Evaluation From Respondents

PROGRAM/ADEQUACY	NUMBER	RELATIVE (PCT)	ADJUSTED (PCT)	CUM (PCT)
KNOWLEDGE AND SKILL WITH DIFFERENT TECHNIQUES OF INSTRUCTION				
Very adequate	91	18.3	18.4	18.4
Adequate	246	49.6	49.8	68.2
Neutral	106	21.4	21.5	89.7
Inadequate	47	9.5	9.5	99.2
Very inadequate	4	0.8	0.8	100.0
No answer	2	0.4	****	100.0
TOTAL	496	100.0	100.0	
UNDERSTANDING TEACHERS' ROLES IN RELATION TO ADMINISTRATORS, SUPERVISORS, AND COUNSELORS				
Very adequate	66	13.3	13.4	13.4
Adequate	206	41.5	41.7	55.1
Neutral	129	26.0	26.1	81.2
Inadequate	85	17.1	17.2	98.4
Very inadequate	8	1.6	1.6	100.0
Not applicable	1	0.2	****	100.0
No answer	1	0.2	****	100.0
TOTAL	496	100.0	100.0	
SKILL IN WORKING WITH PARENTS				
Very adequate	36	7.3	7.3	7.3
Adequate	148	29.8	30.1	37.5
Neutral	130	26.2	26.5	64.0
Inadequate	132	26.6	26.9	90.8
Very inadequate	45	9.1	9.2	100.0
Not applicable	5	1.0	****	100.0
TOTAL	496	100.0	100.0	

TABLE 14 (Continued)

Program Evaluation From Respondents

PROGRAM/ADEQUACY	NUMBER	RELATIVE (PCT)	ADJUSTED (PCT)	CUM (PCT)
SKILL IN WORKING WITH OTHER TEACHERS				
Very adequate	49	9.9	9.9	9.9
Adequate	189	38.1	38.3	48.2
Neutral	145	29.2	29.4	77.5
Inadequate	94	19.0	19.0	96.6
Very inadequate	17	3.4	3.4	100.0
Not applicable	2	0.4	****	100.0
TOTAL	496	100.0	100.0	
ASSESSING AND IMPLEMENTING INNOVATIONS				
Very adequate	47	9.5	9.6	9.6
Adequate	191	38.5	39.1	48.8
Neutral	181	36.5	37.1	85.9
Inadequate	57	11.5	11.7	97.5
Very inadequate	12	2.4	2.5	100.0
Not applicable	4	0.8	****	100.0
No answer	4	0.8	****	100.0
TOTAL	496	100.0	100.0	

Slightly more than half of the respondents (51%) indicated that they had received some computer training as part of their teacher education program (Table 15). Students were not queried, however, on the type or extent of this training. Finally, respondents were asked to list characteristics of the best teacher they had ever had. Seventy-six percent of the respondents mentioned that the best teacher they had ever had was skilled in relating to students and 64 percent mentioned personal characteristics (sense of humor, personable, etc.) of the teacher (Table 16).

TABLE 15

Computer Training During Academic Program

TRAINING	NUMBER	RELATIVE (PCT)	ADJUSTED (PCT)
Yes	141	44.3	50.5
No	138	43.4	49.5
Not applicable	37	11.6	****
No answer	2	0.6	****
TOTAL	318	100.0	100.0

*This question was not asked of Spring, 1980 graduates.

TABLE 16

Characteristics of the Best Teacher

CHARACTERISTIC	NUMBER	PCT OF RESPONSES (R=777**)	PCT OF CASES (N=294***)
Student relations	222	28.6	75.5
Personal characteristics	188	24.2	63.8
Intelligent/professional	162	20.9	55.2
Pupil and class management	112	14.4	38.0
Communicate subject materials	72	9.3	24.3
Interpersonal communications	11	1.3	3.8
Other	10	1.3	3.4

*This question was not asked of Spring, 1980 graduates.

**In situations where respondents could provide multiple answers, the "PCT OF RESPONSES" column contains the percent of total responses falling in a particular category.

***The "PCT OF CASES" column contains the percent of respondents who checked a particular option.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Teacher education graduates from Spring, 1980; Fall, 1980; Winter, 1981; Spring, 1981 and Summer, 1981 were mailed questionnaires asking them to provide demographic, occupational and program evaluation information. Four hundred ninety-six of the graduates (72%) returned the survey.

Results indicated that the majority of the graduates were female, age 22 or under, single, and had been raised in a small town or in a rural setting. Most of the graduates came from upper middle class families where the father was employed in a professional, managerial or farming position and the mother was a housewife.

Academically, the majority of the graduates ranked in the top quarter of their high school graduating class and had ACT scores of 20 or above. Most entered Iowa State as freshmen, whereas 32 percent entered as transfer students. More students graduated Spring Quarters (1980 and 1981) than any of the other quarters, and 59 percent graduated with a grade point average above 3.0.

In general, the graduates indicated that they were satisfied with the length of their student teaching experience, their university and cooperating supervisors during student teaching and the location of their student teaching. Respondents did indicate, however, a higher level of satisfaction with their cooperating supervisors than with their university supervisors.

Forty-six percent of the respondents planned to be certified on the secondary level, whereas 44 percent planned to be certified at the N-K or elementary level and 10 percent, the K-12 level.

More than two-thirds of the graduates planned to teach following graduation and 24 percent had already accepted a teaching position at the time of graduation. Of the students who indicated that they did not plan to teach following graduation, 19 percent had already accepted a non-teaching position.

Most frequently cited reasons for not planning to teach following graduation were "could not find a position in desirable location" and "better salaries in non-teaching positions".

Results from items asking the graduates to rate the relative importance of job characteristics indicated that the respondents most valued opportunities to work with and help people, challenge, and variety in their work. The graduates rated materialistic job characteristics as least important and also gave a relatively low rating to the opportunity to control others. A possible conclusion from this data would be that the teacher education graduates as a group value service and challenge oriented job characteristics higher than power and prestige oriented characteristics.

The graduates gave the highest ratings to the following areas in their teacher education program: content area preparation, planning skills and use of media. Lowest ratings were given to areas involving working with special education children and dealing with behavior problems in the classroom. The graduates assigned above average ratings to all 23 program areas, the average score for all areas being 3.5 on a five-point scale.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The completion of this study was made possible by the contributions of many individuals and offices. We are especially appreciative of the help provided by Joyce Holter and Marge McNeil in the Student Services Office of the College of Education in tracing student records. We also wish to acknowledge the members of the Research Institute for Studies in Education for their many and varied contributions to every phase of the project. Those RISE personnel involved in this study included Valerie Broughton, Diane James and Pat Marlow.

We also wish to thank the teacher education students who took the time to complete the questionnaire. Their cooperation in completing and mailing the questionnaire provided information that will be useful in planning to meet the needs of both current and future teacher education students.